

## **REMARKS**

This paper is filed in response to the official action dated January 29, 2008 (hereafter, the "official action"). This paper is timely filed as it is accompanied by a petition for extension of time and authorization to charge our deposit account in the amount of the requisite fee. The Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in the fees filed, asserted to be filed or which should have been filed herewith to our Deposit Account No. 13-2855, under Order No. 30740/285906.

Claims 1-27 are pending in this application. By the foregoing, claims 1, 4, 13, and 15 have been amended, claims 2, 3, and 14 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, claims 28 and 29 have been added, and the specification has been amended. More specifically, claim 1 has been amended to recite the limitations of (now canceled) claims 2 and 3 and claim 13 has been amended to recite the limitation of (now canceled) claim 14. Claims 4 and 15 have merely been amended to change their dependencies. Support for new claims 28 and 29 may be found, for example, in figures 7 and 8, the paragraph bridging pages 22 and 23 of the application, and in the subsequent paragraphs on page 23. No new matter has been added.

The specification has been objected to because "the abstract of the disclosure does not commence on a separate sheet." The applicants respectfully direct the examiner's attention to page 3 of the preliminary amendment filed December 16, 2004, which includes an abstract commencing on a separate sheet. Accordingly, the objection should be removed.

Additionally, the specification has been objected to because "the title of the invention is not descriptive." The applicants respectfully submit that the title is sufficiently descriptive of the claimed invention. Reconsideration is therefore requested.

Claims 1-26 have been rejected as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, claim 26 has been rejected for assertedly claiming an optical or electrical signal carrier. In response, the specification has been amended to delete the reference to carriers comprising optical or electrical signal carriers. In view of same, applicants respectfully submit that the rejection has been overcome and should be removed.

Claims 1-26 have also been provisionally rejected for obviousness-type double patenting over copending U.S. application serial no. 10/518,182. The rejection will be addressed if it should become mature. In any event, reconsideration is requested in view of the accompanying claim amendments.

Finally, claims 1-5, 10, 11, 13-16, 19, 20, 22, 26, and 27 have been rejected as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,594,463 to Sakamoto. Additionally, claims 6-9, 12, 17, 18, 21, and 23-25 have been rejected as obvious over Sakamoto in view of one or more of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0167471 to Everitt, U.S. Patent No. 6,730,966 to Koyama, U.S. Patent No. 5,075,596 to Young, and U.S. Patent No. 6,861,810 to Rutherford. The art-based rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Examiner indicated that Sakamoto anticipated the subject matter of claims 1-5, 10, 11, 13-16, 19, 20, 22, 26, and 27. The examiner's finding is respectfully contested as applied to amended claims 1 (corresponding to original claims 1-3) and 13 (corresponding to original claims 13-14).

Referring to the Examiner's comments regarding claim 2, applicants acknowledge that Sakamoto states that "here, if the detected voltage drop  $V_f$  [in a forward direction of the EL element] is small, the voltage to be supplied to the driving device is set low. Thus, since the voltage having the minimum limit value of the necessary voltage to function the driving device, is supplied to the driving device, the energy consumption can be reduced." *See* Sakamoto at column 2 lines 22 to 27.

In Sakamoto, the problem is the forward voltage drop of the EL element, which changes as the device ages, the voltage drop gradually increasing. *See* Sakamoto at column 2, lines 13 to 16. Thus, by setting the drive voltage to be sufficiently high in advance to deal with this, power is wasted. *See* Sakamoto at column 1 lines 32 to 42.

In contrast, the claimed invention addresses a different problem, one which is neither recognized nor mentioned in the prior art, which is that in a constant current driven display, there will be a voltage drop across the constant current generator, which depends upon the current drive applied to an OLED. Sakamoto apparently employs a current driven display but has not recognized that the constant current generator can give rise to unnecessary power losses – instead only the EL elements are considered. There is therefore no hint or suggestion in Sakamoto of the problem addressed by the present invention, and thus necessarily, no hint or suggestion of the solution to the problem provided by the claimed invention.

The inventors of the present application recognized that losses can occur in the constant current generator and further recognized that this problem can be solved by operating the constant current generator in the vicinity of its compliance limit. Again, this solution is neither taught nor suggested in the cited prior art – which is not surprising since

the problem itself was not recognized. In support of this assertion, the applicants respectfully submit that the word "compliance" does not appear anywhere in the description or claims of Sakamoto.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of amended claim 1, which recites "a voltage controller ... configured to control said supply voltage such that said constant current generator operates in the vicinity of said constant current generator's compliance limit" is neither disclosed nor suggested by Sakamoto. Similarly, amended claim 14, which recites controlling the supply voltage such that "said constant current generator operates in the vicinity of its compliance limit" is neither disclosed nor suggested by Sakamoto.

The other cited documents do not address these deficiencies, whether taken alone or in any combination with Sakamoto.

The applicants further submit that the dependent claims are patentable for at least the reasons provided above. Additionally, the applicants submit that the subject matter of new claims 27 and 28 is neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited prior art.

### **CONCLUSION**

It is respectfully submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance. Should the examiner wish to discuss the foregoing, or any matter of form or procedure in an effort to advance this application to allowance, he is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

July 29, 2008

/Andrew M. Lawrence/  
Andrew M. Lawrence, Reg. No. 46,130  
Attorney for Applicants  
6300 Sears Tower  
233 S. Wacker Drive  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357  
(312) 474-6300